

Safety Advisory Committee
December 2, 2011
1:30 – 3:00 PM

Minutes

Committee Member	Representing	Present
Anderson, Erik	Materials Sciences Division	
Bello, Madelyn	Human Resources Advisor	X
Blodgett, Paul M.	Environment, Health and Safety Division	
Cademartori, Helen	Information Technology Division	
Carithers, William	Physics Division	
Christensen, John N.	Earth Sciences Division	X
Floyd, Jim	Safety Advisory Committee Chair	X
Franaszek, Stephen	Genomics Division	
Fujikawa, Brian	Nuclear Science Division	X
Lidia, Steve	Accelerator & Fusion Research Division	X
Lukens Jr., Wayne W.	Chemical Sciences Division	X
Lunden, Melissa	Environmental Energy Technologies Division	
Martin, Michael C.	Advanced Light Source Division	X
More, Anil V.	Office of the CFO Advisor	
Taylor, Scott E.	Life Sciences Division	
Tucker, Eugene	Facilities Division	X
Thomas, Patricia M.	Safety Advisory Committee Secretary	X
Walter, Howard	Computing Sciences Directorate	X
Wong, Weyland	Engineering Division	X

Others Present: Mike Carr, Joe Dionne, Mary Gross, Mike Kritscher, Jim Krupnick, Scott Robinson, Bill Wells, Marty White, Mike Wisherop

Comments from the Chair – Jim Floyd

Steve Lidia was introduced as the new representative for the Accelerator and Fusion Research Division. He is a researcher in the Fusion energy program.

Quarterly Meeting with Jim Krupnick regarding SAC Status – Jim Floyd

- **Investigation Process** – During our annual meeting, Paul Alivisatos challenged SAC to help improve the accident/incident investigation process. SAC has identified three aspects of the investigation process where we believe our input would be most useful:
 - **Charter Development** – SAC can draft a template for the charter that would be used to initiate investigations. The charter would set out LBNL's investigation philosophy and serve as a call to action. The template could be tailored for each investigation.

- **Human Performance Improvement (HPI)** – SAC could look at how human performance factors are included in investigations. Andreas would take the lead on this issue. HPI is part of the broader discipline of Organizational Safety.
- **Quality Control** – SAC could be involved in an ongoing overview of the quality of the investigation process rather than a detailed review of individual investigations.

Jim Krupnick and Jim Floyd will work with Paul Alivisatos to confirm that SAC is moving in the right direction. Berkeley Site Office (Mary Gross) concurred with the proposed approach.

- **Top Three Priorities** – The top three safety issues for the Divisions seems to cluster around three themes:
 - **Efficiency vs. risk** also described as safety vs. compliance.
 - **Communication**
 - **EHS services/project integration**

Jim Krupnick commented that understanding customer priorities is a factor that underlies everything. Comments from SAC members included:

- Customer service is an attitude of assisting rather than policing.
- Environmental Health and Safety (EHS) and other Divisions should be asking whether we are doing the right things; for example, lights in Bldg. 77 have to be switched on and off through a breaker panel. This is leading to an extent of condition study. EHS and Divisions are working together to communicate problems and solve them.
- Efficiency and service are the most important issues.
- We should look at the link between efficiency and risk, and integration of safety with project management. Customers are not always right, so customer interaction with EHS could also be improved.
- Training is a factor that applies to all three priorities. We should also look at the frustration with the process of getting things done and the friction that results.
- LBNL should develop a more collaborative safety culture, with everyone helping each other as a community.
- We want to see where the EHS organizational changes go. There is a risk management process improvement initiative going on in Operations as well. EHS resource analysis looked at how other organizations make risk decisions.

- **ESH Peer Review** – There are three peer reviews planned for FY12: Environmental Energy Technologies Division (EETD), Nuclear Science Division, and Engineering Division. The goal of the reviews is to provide useful information to Division Directors. The reviews have been looking at larger management issues, and are complementary to Division Self Assessments and Technical Assurance Program reviews. The peer review teams are created based on the topics to be assessed. There are

more interviews and less data pulls. The product is a short, focused advisory report. The EETD review will assess the Integrated Safety Management roles and responsibilities of the line management chain and integration of new staff. There have been a lot of changes going on in EETD. Several Divisions have been interested in looking at integration of new people into their safety programs. Sometimes cross-divisional issues are identified and passed to other Divisions for action, such as reviews of legacy materials or issues affecting matrixed employees. Division Director interaction and involvement in the reviews is important. Doug Fleming discussed this at the last Division Directors' Meeting.

Jim Krupnick responded that he believed that the proposed SAC activities were appropriate and important to the Lab. He wants to continue to see SAC engage with EHS in productive ways. He expects EHS to develop and present a communication plan for changes in policies.

PPE Subcommittee Report – Marty White

The committee is finding problems with the implementation of the PPE policy rather than with the policy itself. There are differences between the policy as written in PUB-3000, Chapter 19 and how it was communicated and rolled out. There seems to be a disconnect between hazards and controls. There have been about 100 exception requests. The most common exceptions have been for microscope users not being able to work with safety glasses, computer use in technical areas that do not present eye hazards, mixed use office/lab areas, and aisles and walkways. Exemptions have also been requested for storage areas, laser labs that require different eyewear, and tour and visitor groups where hazardous work is suspended during the tour. Life sciences labs have requested exemptions for tissue culture processes and biosafety cabinet use with the sash down. Some "technical areas" have minimal or intermittent chemical use, such as inspection, shipping, and mechanical assembly areas. The policy adoption did not create changes in practice for most shops and chemical labs. If implemented as written, the policy provides for evaluation of hazards and controls by the Area Safety Lead. There are questions about whether the Area Safety Lead concept works in mixed-use areas. There are contradictions between manuals (PUB-3000, Chemical Hygiene and Safety Plan, etc.) about the definition of "technical area". There are too many postings on some lab doors. The exception policy is not clear. The chemical safety subject matter experts (Larry McLouth and Scott Taylor) should be engaged to define appropriate chemical safety requirements. Food and drink restrictions and biohazard controls also need to be considered. OSHA says controls can be task-based or area-based. The subcommittee expects to deliver their recommendations by the end of January.

Safety Culture – Mike Ruggieri

LBNL safety performance has improved over the past years and it has reached a level at which additional significant improvement will be difficult to achieve unless we advance our safety culture. For Phase 1, we conducted a survey about a year ago to assess the state of our safety culture. There was a good response to the survey and the results were shared with the Divisions. For Phase 2, we will be making improvements based on that data and other information. Safety culture is a shared belief system where safety is integral to work. It is part of a good work culture. Senior leaders are engaged in envisioning the future state we want to see at LBNL. Line Management will integrate safety into every activity. The safety culture work group is meeting every two weeks. They are developing a work plan and communications plan. They will be coordinating Division initiatives and developing Lab-wide initiatives. Public Affairs is involved in planning outreach and feedback. A long-term strategic plan will be developed.

Requirements Management/PUB-3000 – Lydia Young

The requirements management process will ensure the flow-down of contract requirements into implementing policies and procedures. It will manage the documents that drive compliance. It will include a clear definition of requirements and traceability through documentation. When a policy changes, the implementing policies will be identified, reviewed, and revised as needed. The ability to find a requirement, understand it, and act on it will result in timely compliance. The requirements management process will include analyzing problems, performing a cost/risk analysis, an implementation and communication plan, and involvement by senior Lab management and Division line management.

A Requirements Management Committee has been formed. It includes representatives from Operations, Engineering, and EHS. There are no research division representatives at this time. Cross-functional expertise is needed. The committee will look at all policies related to Contract 31, including non-safety policies such as space management. The committee is meeting monthly. The committee will function like an "air traffic controller for new policies -- it will centralize coordination and communication of policies and facilitate collaboration between standing committees and working groups. The committee will provide quality assurance recommendations. There will be a database to record why policy decisions were made. The system will include processes and tools that can be used Lab-wide. It has evolved from the CC1 corrective action.

The Regulations and Procedures Manual (RPM) is being revised and integrated with PUB-3000. The RPM will include program descriptions as well as processes. There will be safety policy briefs in the RPM. PUB-3000 is also being re-formatted.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 PM
Respectfully submitted, Patricia M. Thomas, SAC Secretary